UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Stopping Hitler Is Not Enough - - - - - - - - - *Dorothy Bushnell Cole*

Now That the President Has Spoken - - - - - - - - *Royal Wilbur France*

Nations Must Coöperate - *O. A. Hammand*

In Place of Hans - - - *Wesner Fallaw*

Challenge from a Star - - *Angela Morgan*

VOLUME CXXVII NUMBER 1

Chicago, March 3, 1941

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Declaration

In this time of growing tension of opinion and intolerance of spirit, it is appropriate that UNITY should reaffirm its position as a journal of liberal opinion.

UNITY is interested in no political party or platform, is bound to no school of philosophy or theology, is the organ of no sect or denomination, and is the voice of no organized movement. Rather is UNITY dedicated to certain underlying principles, namely, freedom, fellowship, and character in religion. It seeks the fulfilment of certain ideals, namely, representative democracy, peace, brotherhood, the commonwealth of man which is the kingdom of God on earth.

In dedication to its principles and in pursuit of its ideals, UNITY maintains the rule of liberty. Its editors, editorial contributors, and correspondents speak with unfettered freedom the convictions of their own minds within the general framework of a journal of liberal opinion. The writers of articles, reviews, and poems present their own ideas, which may, at times, be at variance with those of the editors. UNITY would repress no utterance and control no argument that is competent and honest, for it is skeptical of conformity and averse to authority, which always tend to hamper individual liberty. It is happy in those diversities of gifts and ideas which are the glory of the one spirit.

In this period of trial and crisis, UNITY would unite anew its editors and readers in the service of *Character* which is the substance of religion, *Freedom* which is its life, and *Fellowship* which is its goal. Thus would we vindicate our country, our civilization, our culture, religious and lay, in a period when all alike are threatened with extinction.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
- Editorial Comment—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 3
- Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 5

ARTICLES—
- Stopping Hitler Is Not Enough—DOROTHY BUSHNELL COLE 6
- Now That the President Has Spoken—ROYAL WILBUR FRANCE .. 9
- Nations Must Coöperate—O. A. HAMMAND 10
- In Place of Hans—WESNER FALLAW 12
- On the Pacifist Front—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 13

POETRY—
- Challenge from a Star—ANGELA MORGAN 11

THE STUDY TABLE—
- The Voice of Zona Gale—C. A. HAWLEY 14
- The "Moral Equivalent of War"—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 14
- Woman and Archaeology—C. A. HAWLEY 15

CORRESPONDENCE—
- Democracy and the Negro—VICTOR S. YARROS 16
- The Bible Trap—and Lincoln!—JAMES A. FAIRLEY 16
- Objections to Mr. Chworowsky's Article:
  - I—FLORA WHITE 16
  - II—BLANCHE WATSON 16

THE FIELD—
- Tapioca for Hemisphere Defense!—*Nofrontier News Service* 2
- The Midlands—ADIN BALLOU 15

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Tapioca for Hemisphere Defense!

The United States Government is at last striking realistically at the basic problem facing hemisphere defense. Through a new organization, the Inter-American Development Commission, it is quietly working on a positive program that has so far received little attention in the press. This Commission seeks to meet the real threat to western hemisphere solidarity—axis economic penetration—by helping Latin-American countries to decrease their economic dependence upon Europe.

Created on June 3, 1940, by action of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee which was formed at the Conference of Panama, the Commission is basing its function on the theory that unless Latin America can sell to the United States, it will have to sell to Europe, in which case the whole question of hemisphere solidarity would become largely academic.

Chief difficulty in the way of larger sales of South American goods to the United States is that in many cases they compete with U. S. produce. Therefore, one of the aims of the Inter-American Development Commission has been to stimulate the creation of new industries in Latin-American countries that do not compete with North American industry and agriculture. The Commission has undertaken two initial projects. The first of these is production of handicraft goods in South America for sale in United States department stores. The goods to be made under this project are not of a type to compete with handicraft in the United States, and are designed to replace articles formerly imported from Europe. Before the war, this business amounted to fifty million dollars a year. The project, which includes a survey of possibilities by a group of technicians, calls for the establishment of Latin-American organizations to handle the business at that end of the line, employment of both North and South American enterprise and capital, and training of South Americans in producing for North American markets.

The second project looks toward the establishment in Brazil of a plant for processing mandioca, or tapioca. When such business is established, Brazilians will be able to inaugurate a whole new series of industries dependent upon the unique type of starch procurable from mandioca. Such industries include the adhesive and dextrine, and certain parts of the textile and paper industries. A ready market should also be found in the United States for the tapioca itself, since at present Java is our only source of supply.

As in the case of the handicraft project, the tapioca development is to be jointly undertaken by North and South Americans. Brazilians will supply the

(*Continued on page* 15)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVII MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1941 No. 1

Editorial Comment

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

Certain prospects of this war seem to me to be perfectly plain. Among them are the following:

Adolf Hitler has small chance of conquering the British Empire. He may wreck it so terribly as to weaken it beyond recovery for generations, but he is not likely to overthrow and capture it. The resources of the Empire are too great, its people too determined to permit surrender or extinction.

Britain has small chance of defeating Hitler and conquering the Reich. A British victory could be won only by landing troops on the continent, which seems to be as improbable as any move that can be imagined. Britain may do incalculable damage to Germany by blockade and bombardment, but she will not destroy her.

The war may go on for years, perhaps for decades —another thirty or even hundred years' war! Never was the destructive capacity of man so great, but never also his productive capacity so great. Only the complete exhaustion of natural resources, or the breakdown of transportation, can bring this conflict to an end.

Before exhaustion comes, mankind will be stricken by famine, pestilence, immeasurable misery and death. Revolt will anticipate exhaustion, and in all countries desperate populations will engulf the world in chaos. Governments will be overthrown, wealth will disappear, order and culture will be swept away, and the Dark Ages returned.

America is safe from all attack. Fear of invasion is groundless, the building of vast armaments unnecessary. But if we cannot be reached by the sword and the bomb, we certainly can and may be caught in the maelstrom of ruin now preparing to engulf our civilization, but only with our own consent.

The war must some day end; it cannot go on forever. Why should it not end now, while there is still vitality enough left in the world to insure a restoration of some part at least of what has already been lost? Why prolong the war, in hopes of a victory which neither side can win, to an hour too late to save mankind from doom? Why should not America use the immense advantage of her position not to join and thus indefinitely continue the war, but to hasten peace?

II

The colleges are beginning to redeem themselves. After President Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, with his cool analysis and stern admonition, comes President Henry Noble MacCracken, with words that would sober any nation that is not already quite insane. In an address before the annual meeting of the Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation, he asked that reason and religion unite to resist "the gigantic conspiracy to plunge the nation into war." This conspiracy, he said, was deliberately plotted by American diplomacy which was "designed to affront the enemies of Britain, and bring on a situation from which war would be the only way out." Challenging those who want us to join up with Britain, Dr. MacCracken said:

> We are still outside the battle. We have never agreed that Britain is fighting our war. We are not agreed that invasion is either near or that it threatens a nation situated as we are if we bend our efforts to resist invasion at the point of invasion, which is the American hemisphere.

Speaking of democracy and war in the present instance, he said:

> There are some who say that by going to war we shall achieve true democracy at home, that England is more democratic as a result of the war. Why, then, a Viscount Halifax in our midst? In what way can deficits and eventual bankruptcy hasten democracy? It is dictatorships that are built on receiverships, not democracy.

Dr. MacCracken stated that he loathed the Nazi and Fascist regimes, but could not subscribe to any thesis that "the guilt is all Germany's, or that even a preponderance of guilt on Germany's part makes this our battle, or even a battle of ideologies."

> We are not ready to sanction British rule of the black and brown races of the earth, or to enlarge her maritime tyranny. . . . Neither are we ready to assume responsibility for a world rule, even in the interest of democracy and freedom. For us to engage in a war to preserve one group of empires against another has no shadow of moral justification.

All of this sounds to me like good history, good sense, and good Americanism. It redeems, as a counterweight, the wild hysteria of bad history, bad sense, and bad Americanism which has beset so many of our

colleges at the behest of frightened faculties and panicky presidents. The fight is not lost yet! With such counsels still being freely spoken, we may keep this country out of a war which is not our war, but, imperialistic to the core, is only one more chapter of Europe's horror. I need not remind the readers of UNITY that this has been the Editor's attitude from the beginning, and will be to the end.

III

In a recent issue of UNITY (January 20th, page 147), there was quoted a remark of Major George Fielding Eliot, that Northern Ireland had "not been severely bombed as yet, being well out of reach of German planes," as indicating how casual remarks are inadvertently dropped from time to time which reveal the sheer insanity of all this loose talk about the Nazis invading America. Another beautiful example of this sort of thing has just come to hand in the press reports of the British capture of Benghazi in Italian Libya. Says the account of the victory:

> Italian and German planes had been pushed back to a point where they could no longer bomb Alexandria or Suez from North African bases.

How far had this "point" been "pushed back"? The same dispatch continues:

> The Axis had been thrown back 700 miles from Alexandria, 800 miles from Suez, so that an effective bombing campaign against the eastern Mediterranean from African bases was no longer possible.

Seven hundred, eight hundred miles! And here we are in this country jittery over the coming bombardment of our shores by Nazi planes from well over 3000 miles away!! We are either ourselves mad—or else the victims of as wicked a campaign of calculated fear and deception as this nation has ever seen. Perhaps this is what Major Al. Williams, flying expert for the Scripps-Howard newspaper syndicate, had in mind when he testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that all talk of invasion, or even attack, from abroad is "nonsense," "horror stories" and "fantasies," and denounced the dissemination of such "stuff" as the "persistent promotion of hysteria by both the administration and several powerful groups in this country." Let us have this clear! This whole scare about the Nazis crossing the seas to attack us has no imaginable basis in fact. It is simply a "bogey man" created by Washington to put over the most extravagant and dangerous pro-war legislation that this country has ever seen. The same pattern was followed in the last war, when it was the Kaiser who was going to conquer America. Imagine hardheaded Americans falling for this propaganda a second time!

IV

I sympathize profoundly with the disturbed folk all about us these distracting days—disturbed at what is happening to our democracy, at the ills that are multiplying, the injustices that are being done, the progress and enlightenment that are being lost. My desk is cluttered these days with protests at this, that, and the other abomination. Negroes are being subjected to the grossest discrimination in the armed forces of the nation, and in the industrial defense plants! Trade unions are being threatened on every front, with rights to strike, picket, and even organize placed in sudden jeopardy! Civil rights are being infringed, or altogether denied, with hideous instances of repression and persecution all about us! Militarism is pouring into our schools and colleges, like water rushing from broken pipes! Intolerance of opinion is rife among us, and bitterness of temper everywhere prevalent! And the Lend-Lease Bill is coolly proposing to substitute an out-and-out personal dictatorship for the rule of law and constitution! What wonder that people are frightened and disgusted. But—*what do they expect?* A war is on, dear friends; and when war arrives, democracy and civilization, the rights of man and the practices of culture, justice, liberty, decency, humaneness, all these disappear. Sometimes the process of disappearance is fast, as in Spain, sometimes it is slow, as in England, depending upon background, experience, tradition, custom. In this country the process is fast rather than slow. But whatever the pace, the result is ultimately the same. Gibbon says that war is "the art of destroying the human species." In somewhat the same way it may be said that war is the art of destroying civilization—the one sure means of barbarizing mankind. This war, if it keeps going, will sweep away everything that man has gained and achieved in the last thousand years. Progress will not only be stayed, but our whole world be swept back over the highway of its advance into the dark jungles from which painfully so long ago it emerged. In the face of such impending calamity, it seems rather silly to get excited about this outrage and that iniquity. Why not get excited about *war,* and fight war as the source today of all our danger? Do we want to protect the Negroes, to save the trade unions and their gains, to preserve civil liberties, to outlaw militarism, to exterminate intolerance and hate, to guarantee democracy against totalitarianism? Then let us get rid of war! With war, all is lost; with peace, all may be won. Seven hundred years ago, in his *De Monarchia,* Dante laid down peace as the condition of all well-being. Is it not time that we struck straight and sure at this our goal?

V

Switzerland is a land which has long been hospitable to political refugees, but this free country has a law forbidding to these refugees the privilege of writing or speaking on political affairs. As a champion of unlimited free speech, I cannot approve this law; but occasionally, in my weaker moments perhaps, I sympathize with its purpose. Especially is this the case

when I see aliens who have fled their homes beating the tom-tom of war here in America. What moral right have such aliens to embroil this country in European conflicts? Why should they ask us to pull their nationalistic chestnuts out of a fire kindled by their own diplomats and soldiers? With what grace do they suggest that we clean up the mess into which their native lands have blundered? Erika Mann, the ordinary daughter of a very great father, has been using assiduously a pen dipped in her father's renown to arouse this nation to get into the war against Germany. She wants to get rid of Hitler, which is laudable enough, and wants us to do the job, which is impudent enough. Then there are Genevieve Tabouis and Eve Curie, who are laboring here night and day to spread the European war to the western hemisphere. But why go on naming these warmongers who want this country to follow the brave example of Europe? Their articles crowd the columns of our newspapers and magazines, their books clog the printing presses, their voices ring from our forum platforms. Here is a "fifth column" to match point by point the German "fifth column." The latter, to be sure, is largely secret, and the former is wide open, in its operations. But I count it nonetheless dangerous that the Frenchmen and Norwegians and Belgians and Englishmen swarming to our shores should be so clamorously shouting "Come on in, the water's fine!" It is bad enough to have Americans of the Dorothy Thompson and Ralph Barton Perry type dancing their war dances and intoning their war songs. But when added to native voices are these refugee voices so plaintive and thus persuasive in appeal, the situation becomes rather desperate. I would not question the sincerity and profound pity of these refugees; least of all would I consent to any ban upon them. Rather do I have in mind only the proprieties of the occasion. After all, these persons are our guests, and guests do not often offer suggestions, certainly not instructions, to their hosts as to the management of their households. They accept gratefully the hospitality they enjoy, and leave their hosts to determine their own domestic economy and neighborhood policy.

VI

Is there any influence in the world today to compare with that of the Christian church? Look at the Vatican, as steadfast in its allegiance to the cause of peace as on the first day of this brutal and barbaric struggle between empires. If ever the Roman Church was worthy of its sacred inheritance from the grace of Christ, it is at this hour when it seeks to restore peace to the stricken multitudes of Europe. Consider the Malvern Conference in England, when great churchmen, sitting under heavens dripping with the "ghastly dew" foretold by Tennyson, formulated their program of the new world of mutual aid, economic coöperation, and political union which must follow upon this vast conflict of arms if civilization is to endure. At the very time, in other words, when England is hardest pressed, the church prepares and publishes war aims which the state has stubbornly refused to define. This is enlightenment of the first order—and leadership of a type to put to shame the so-called government of the realm. Then turn to Norway, and behold a courage in the clergy unrivalled by statesmen or soldiers. Seven Protestant bishops addressed a letter to the congregations, warning the country of the dangers of the pro-Nazi Quisling ideology and administration. Braving action by the police, the pastors of Norway in scores of churches read this letter from their pulpits. This fits in with the continuing practice of the pastors, in the face of absolute orders of prohibition, of reading special prayers for King Haakon and the old country. Some of the ministers, at the request of their congregations, do not thus endanger themselves, but the congregations, "in spontaneous and moving homage, read aloud the prayers for the King." The churches, it is reported, are crowded, as the people find before the altars of God, under the blessing of their heroic clergy, the only freedom left them under Nazi rule. The same is true of Holland, where the churches are rallying the people to liberty. It may be asked, whence lies the power of the church these days? First of all, in the negative fact that the church has no material force at its disposal. Its weakness in every wordly sense—this is its initial strength. Then, secondly, is the positive fact that the church has principles which are of eternal, not temporal, significance; ideals which are of spiritual, not physical, moment; aims and purposes which concern not governments and empires and territories and wealth, but the enduring values of humanity and God. The church has not a gun nor a bomb, yet wields a power greater than that of premiers and fuehrers. That is, *if it is true to itself!* The tragedy comes when, as so largely in this country, clergy and church surrender to the state and its foul business of making war.

Jottings

A recent writer declares the following solution of the civil liberties program:

> Extend liberty to every one who stands for liberty for his fellow creature, but put in a concentration camp every one who advocates the concentration camp for his neighbor.

Which surely means that the author of this program must himself go to a concentration camp! And then what becomes of liberty?

The Italian press is attacking bitterly the American press. Our newspapers are publishing only news un-

favorable to Italy! Well, what other news is there?

Nofrontier News Service announces that, after twenty years of service, the Y. M. C. A. has been ordered dissolved in Greece.

> The plant is to be taken as government property. Youth, including the Boy and Girl Scout organizations, will be taken over into an organization of young people modeled on the Nazis' Hitler Youth.

All in the interest of democracy, we have no doubt!

Mr. Stimson, who saw England last July going down in 30 days, now has her face to face with final disaster in 60 to 90 days. Mr. Willkie, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, saw us going into the war in 30 days if England collapsed, but, when confronted by incredulity, lengthened the period to 60 or 90 days.

Thirty, sixty, ninety days—where do these eminent statisticians get these figures?

Actions speak louder than words! The United States government has recently ordered four and a half million (4,500,000) identification tags for dead and wounded soldiers.

Colgate University is installing boxing in the curriculum "as a contribution to national defense." When Hitler's troopers land on these shores, in other words, the college boys will march right up and smash them in the solar plexus. We wonder if the University of California boys are being taught jiu-jitsu, to repel the Japanese invasion!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Stopping Hitler Is Not Enough

DOROTHY BUSHNELL COLE

Americans may be classified in their attitude toward war into three groups. The first group is composed of those who want nothing to do with war, who think that it is a relic of barbarism, and who want to isolate themselves from it. These people argue that you never can achieve peace by preparations for war, that the two things are irreconcilably opposed to each other, and that disarmament is the way to peace.

The second group argues that the way to peace is through armaments that will make invasion impossible, and that will act as a deterrent to a prospective aggressor. They argue that we should remain isolated, but strong in our defenses, self-sufficient, if necessary, in our economy, and able to withstand any assault.

The third group argues that peace for a world, like peace for a local community, comes as a by-product of law and order, law and order conceived of and instituted by the collective will of the community, the ideas and ideals of the majority of the people, the expression of the social consciousness. And this collective ideal, this will of the majority, this social conscience and consciousness, when expressed in their entirety, we call by one word, and that word is government.

If people give their support and their faith to this thing they have set up, if they nurture it with loving and efficient hands, if they conceive of it always as something to benefit all the people and not just a few, and are willing to surrender something of personal freedom to it, something of individual sovereignty over their activities and lives, then government works.

In many, if not in most communities, the people, through their government, in order to have their collective will secured and maintained, establish a police force, a vigilant arm of the law, a tool through which the will of the majority is enforced. Of course the police force is only one arm of the law. Its services go into many fields, but it is that arm which is specifically created to deal with the lawbreaker, the offender against society, the opposer of the community will.

This third group of people, like the members of the first two groups, want to keep America out of war. They believe that all these rules which I have tried to show obtain for a local or national situation, obtain also for a world, for an international situation; and that until the nations of the earth sense this, and set up a world government, there will be war. And unless that government has arms and can serve as a threat to would-be aggressor nations, a threat that will be backed up with action if necessary, there will be war.

After the first World War, there was an attempt to set up such a government, such a machinery for peace. But we did not give it enough of faith, of support, of prestige to make it permanently effective and powerful. We in the United States did not even identify ourselves with it at all, and other countries tried to use it for their own selfish and individual ends. The result has been that disgruntled, humiliated, sick, and prostrated nations have known that, if they should want to take the law into their own hands, international government would not be strong enough to stop them. Such nations could go forth with the idea of divide and rule, to get what they wanted from one nation at a time, on the theory that nations would not unite as one great force to stop the lawbreaker. That government, which the community as a whole had tried to set up for itself, was not taken seriously enough by its members, was not given the faith and support necessary to make it function.

And so it looks as if we have gone back to an unorganized world community, where piracy and banditry abound, where each nation is a law unto itself, goes after the thing it wants because it wants it, and because it knows that no adequate agency to stop it has been created. Such now I conceive to be the state of the world. Such now is the situation which I conceive to be comparable to life in our own western towns before governments had been established by groups that had not as yet conceived of themselves as communities.

Lawlessness in the world must be stopped. Law and order must come into being. The forces of evil, of greed, of totalitarianism, and suppression of all individual liberties, the forces that pit race against race, creed against creed, that are determined to dominate each life, each phase of that life, must be suppressed; and the things we have held blessed and sacred, for which our fathers fought, bled, and died, must not perish from the earth. When I say all aid to Britain, everything to stop Hitler, I see our world in the same state that the frontier town was in before the strong sheriff came, a state where each man had to carry his own gun for self-protection.

Everything that the League of Nations accomplished, everything that it ever hoped to be or to become, will go if the Axis powers win this war. They are out for world domination. They are out to make us all slaves. They are out to assume control of our buying and selling, of our producing and distributing, of our work and of our play, of our worship and of our education. This is no imperialist war between two or more powers that all want the same colony, the same trade route, the same market, or source of raw material. This is a revolution of Nihilism, a war to crush and destroy, to dominate and humiliate.

And so I say we must stop Hitler, the bandit, just as we stop the lawbreaker in a local community, just as we stop the anti-social person in the group that has not yet set up its government. We must stop Hitler, or else be overrun as a world, as a human race, by everything that is evil and anti-social.

And I do not care what we call it when we stop Hitler. Call it war, call it military sanctions, call it aid to Britain. We must stop Hitler. A comparable situation in a local community we might describe as the police force going into action. Or if the policeman is not around we do not hesitate to take the law into our own hands, we rush out to stop the kidnaper, we try to disarm the robber that has broken in at night. We dive in to save the drowning child when the life guard is not present, we put out the fire when the fireman has not come. When government has not been set up or when it is not functioning we do not sit back and say we will do nothing because we do not believe in force, in war, that the use of force is evil. When it is used against society by a minority it is immoral. When it is used to establish the will of the community, of the majority, it is moral.

Herein lies the difference between the policeman and the soldier. The one is used as an arm, as an employee of the law, the other is used by some form of local government or nation in violation of international agreements, of international morality. But our world government has broken down so we cannot invoke military sanctions which I compare to the police force of the organized community. And these military establishments which each country, one at a time, is using, first China, then Ethiopia, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Belgium, Holland, France, and England to stop the lawbreaker, I compare to the practice in pioneer towns, where, for lack of police and government, each citizen assumes the right to carry and to use his own weapons.

So we must stop Hitler. But also, and with equal emphasis, I say that as we stop him in order to stop future Hitlers, future aggressors, and war-makers, we must build a world united, federated, organized on democratic principles, willing to abide by the will of the majority, willing to submit disputes to arbitration, and willing, also, to rule out the right to make aggression, which, if partaken of by everyone or every country, would produce a world of complete chaos. We must realize, as we stop Hitler, that the great federal union which our fathers established on this continent, to which each state surrendered something of sovereignty, represents the best, perhaps the only principle yet devised by man to avert war, and must be applied wholeheartedly to the international scene.

But these things are not all. Yes, we must stop Hitler; true, we must build a world government, both colossal tasks, perhaps impossible of achievement. But there is a third task as I see it, a greater task, a harder one for us of the remaining democracies to achieve.

I am not a psychiatrist, nor even a trained psychologist, but from some study and much living I am convinced that Fascism is to a nation what paranoia is to an individual. And paranoia may be briefly and superficially, and doubtless only partially, described by the following:

It is in the nature of human beings (normal and conducive to self-preservation, health, and happiness) to want certain things, possessions, symbols of prestige, emblems of power and of importance. Nobody wants to be a nobody. Most every little girl or boy begins to talk about a time when he or she will have possessions for their own sake and as symbols of power and prestige. We see people go through endless struggle and sacrifice to achieve not alone security, but, beyond that, power and prestige, and possessions out of all relation to demands.

We have all seen how children can suffer over such things as what mother wears, how father eats, what church parents attend, how well grandpa or mother or someone else speaks English; and many teachers can tell of children who are ashamed to tell how father makes a living. Power, prestige, and possession dominate much of our life. As I understand it, paranoia begins when the anxiety lest we lack these things becomes too great, too anguishing. This steadily mounting anxiety that we are not important, that we lack power, lack belongings, turns in time into fear, and fear, as we know, is the breeder of hostilities and hates. When this anxiety is too great we grow to feel people are against us, then we grow to feel the world in general is against us, is hostile to us, and we, in turn, become hostile toward the world. These paranoids are not easily detectable. They are ashamed of their feelings of hostility and try to conceal them under all manner of thoughtfulness and ways of kindness. But in reality they cannot tolerate success or importance in anyone else, in the people that surround them. They must crush and dominate, suppress and repress all who cross their paths, not only those against whom they might have a just grievance, but everybody must be thought the worst of, everybody must be belittled and discouraged, humiliated and found wanting. Any show of thoughtfulness on the paranoid's part makes him feel unimportant, any giving of himself in love seems to him like weakness, he is sure the world is against him, is sure people are trying to deceive and rob him. His wealth, if he has acquired it, he cannot enjoy, and he achieves a sense of power from depriving others of the use of it, of denying it to those for whom one would expect he had struggled.

So what is it that has made Germany, for instance,

fascist? First, the sense of inferiority resulting from her emergence late into the family of great nations, that sense of being *parvenu, nouveau arrivé;* second, that complex she had about encirclement, an assurance even before World War I that she was surrounded by enemies; third, the humiliation of the defeat itself at the end of that war; and fourth, the devastating peace with all of the sores and open wounds it created, reparations impossible of payment, economic and financial commissions that entered with an iron hand to *run* Germany; fifth, her disarmament, without the accompanying and promised disarmament of the Allies; and lastly, the humiliations of the occupation of the Ruhr and the Rhineland *after* peace was declared and all was supposed to be well.

Something had to snap in a Germany in whose capital city on a certain Sunday during inflation sixty people committed suicide. Something had to snap in a Germany whose young people for want of clothes were forming nudist colonies in homes they built from packing boxes in the outskirts of Berlin. Something had to snap in a Germany, which, knowing she was a great, a gifted, a once powerful and able nation, suffered too greatly, developed too tremendous a fear that she did not have power, prestige and possession. Yes, something snapped, she developed the "unsanity," the hostility, the incapacity for truthfulness, the need for domination that we call paranoia; that which in nations I see fit to call fascism.

The opportunity was lost, before the disease became established, to rebuild a healthy and a happy Germany. If we had disarmed as we promised, if we had joined the League of Nations with Germany when Stresemann succeeded in achieving her admission, if we had not put up the Smoot-Hawley tariff which made reparations-payments impossible, if we, as one of the Allies, had seen, with President Wilson, the absolute necessity of a peace without victory, we might have had a well Germany, able to take her place at the table of the family of nations to which she might have made a noble and lofty contribution. But now it is too late. The problem-child which we helped to produce has now become a menace and must *now* be removed from society, be stopped, be incarcerated or committed to an institution. In some way society must be protected against him.

So we see a sick people, who, quite naturally, have chosen a sick leader. We must remember two things. First, that they hate everybody, not just us with our great wealth and power which they covet, and which helped to create their too great sense of inadequacy and inferiority, nor Great Britain and France whom they hate for similar reasons, but every nation. We first saw this hatred show itself toward the Jews, then toward Czechoslovakia, that citadel of Democracy, toward innocent, little, harmless and neutral Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, finally beautiful France herself.

And here is where I wish to enlist the aid of the psychiatrists, to tell me if I am right in a theory I have, namely, that all this hideous hostility, this hate that kills and lies, that burns and bombs, that destroys and lays waste, is infectious, is contagious. I want them, the psychiatrists, to tell me if persons who perhaps start out with beautiful dispositions and loving hearts, tend, from too intimate association with paranoids, to become paranoids themselves.

Do you see the real, the subtle danger of Hitler, of Fascism? Do you see a people grown sick from hostility infecting the world with that sickness, turning our great America (both North and South, where Democracy has been incubating for over a century and a half preparing for a lovely harvest) into a cesspool of hate, of battles, of bloodshed, of misery and destruction? If we hate Hitler—and this is my warning—as Hitler hates us, then we too will be destroyed. We, too, will become like him, will take up the sword to die by the sword; we, too, will become a hemisphere of paranoids, clawing each other with bloody and poisonous talons, snarling at each other with fangs filled with venom. If such a human race evolves, it would be better dead. Let it disappear from the face of the earth as the dinosaur disappeared. Let the earth become fair again, a new Eden into which some new and wiser Adam may be generated.

What I am saying is that we must stop Hitler as the policeman stops the lawbreaker. Our attitude of mind must be that of the policeman in the line of duty —no hostility, no hate, just calmly, dispassionately ridding the community of a great menace. It must be the attitude of mind of the doctor, the physician who rolls up his sleeves and sets to work to rid a town or city of plague or pestilence, to stop an epidemic. He does not let himself get tied up in knots with complexes of hate about the germs, nor with what the psychiatrists call "aggressions" as the result of frustrations. No, he simply says, "A menace is here. I have the knowledge how it can be curbed and stopped. Give me your coöperation and we will win." If he destroys himself with hating those germs, then they have truly won.

Is it too much to expect that we can stop Hitler, can war on Hitler, if necessary, and yet maintain a loving attitude? If we can, we can win; if we cannot, then Hitler wins, and this regardless of where a military victory may show itself.

If we stop Hitler, and, at the same time keep love in our hearts, maintain a completely loving attitude toward him, toward Germany, Japan, Italy, and Fascism generally, we will emerge not only with more of life to enjoy, but with a colossal strength through love and understanding, through coöperation and tolerance, superior to anything that has ever been known in the world before. This time when I say "we" I mean our great hemisphere, ourselves in the United States with our achievements in self-government, Brazil to the south, with her great strides in practicing as well as preaching race equality, Chile with her many successes in democratic practices, little Uruguay with her permanent New Deal, and the great Argentine, who, like ourselves, has made such great strides in the field of production. I see our Western Hemisphere, from north to south, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, dedicated to a philosophy of individual initiative and enterprise, to a competitive system, if you will, and yet so tempered by love, by understanding, by coöperation, as to be a beacon light for the creation of a new world.

To sum up. (1) We must stop Hitler, because once paranoia has been firmly established there is no curing it with love, with understanding, with disarmament and appeasement. The paranoid must simply be placed in such a position that his acts do not mean death and destruction for others. (2) We must be planning on the new world order we want after Hitler is stopped, an order based not on totalitarian principles, but on democratic ones. (3) We must keep detached, clinical, loving, almost scientific in our attitude as we manufacture and wield our instruments of destruction.

Now That the President Has Spoken

ROYAL WILBUR FRANCE

Without much regard for democratic procedures, the President has committed us to war. The technical distinction that we are not sending men to defend England is not important. Winston Churchill states that men will not be needed in 1941. Clearly we will send them, if and when needed. The logic of the President's policy calls for not allowing England to be defeated if any force which we can apply will prevent her defeat. Our policy is now clearly defined. The important question now is where it will lead.

In the prophetic book, *The Education of Henry Adams,* written in 1905, the historian pointed out that the accelerating development of power demanded either a new social mind or the correction of old institutions by violence. He hoped for the former but feared the latter. The mechanization of industry which began toward the end of the eighteenth century and the ever-increasing use of power had completely changed man's economic problem and possibilities. Thought habits and emotional patterns were not ready, however, for a change from the old order representing privilege for a few and privation for the many to one of true economic democracy. We see clearly now that with ever-increasing ability to produce more with less labor mankind had for the first time in human history the possibility of creating an economy of abundance. But the money made by the owners consisted of the differential between selling prices and costs known as profits, and the managers of industry in seeking profits for the owners felt obliged to hold down costs lest there should be no profits. The most vulnerable cost was the wage paid to labor. Hence wages were held down and during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth century, there have been constant and sometimes bloody wars between employers and employees all over the industrialized world. The important fact overlooked was that mass production demands as its absolute equivalent mass consumption. It should have been evident that goods could not be indefinitely produced in great quantities if they could not be sold and consumed in quantities equally great and that this could not occur if the masses of the people, representing labor, could not buy in quantities substantially equal to what was produced. This was not seen clearly because the owners and managers were looking at the costs and profits of particular businesses rather than seeing the problem as a whole.

The economic forces set in motion by invention and power paid no more respect to rank and the ancient privileges than cats do to kings. Production became ever more plentiful but the wise men in charge of affairs could not see that two plus two equals four or that mass production demands as its absolute equivalent mass consumption so that instead of building up markets at home by increasing the prosperity of the working masses, they paid them inhumanly low wages and sought markets for their products in other lands. When a country like England or Germany became industrialized another problem arose. Machines like men are hungry. They must be fed with raw materials. England was the first country to capitalize on the Industrial Revolution. Indeed it began there. So England changed from a self-sufficient nation to a great world organization dependent on the outside world for raw materials and markets. What she wanted she took with ruthless disregard for the rights of other peoples. Her Empire spread over the world. It imposed itself by force and maintained itself by force. France and other countries followed suit. Germany entered the game of Empire late. When, under Bismarck, the technically-minded genius of the German people resulted in the same need for raw materials and markets as had motivated other nations, she began reaching out for colonies and markets. World War I resulted. If the capacity of people, including the President of the United States, for self-deception were not practically infinite, we would admit that the issues of that war were not settled by the Treaty of Versailles. We would not, as does the President, over-simplify the present world situation into a conflict between innocent people and brigands. We would, to use the fine phrase of Dr. Albert Edward Day, display "the love which ferrets out causes." Because neither our people nor our statesmen are ready for such an exercise of wisdom, we are now committed to the course of war. It is the coercive violence which Henry Adams feared would bring the needed social change rather than the social mind for which he hoped.

Now that our course is laid, however, we may examine where it will lead. The first immediate result of our decision is to rule out the possibility of a negotiated peace. England, with our aid assured, is in no mood to appease Hitler. The next immediate result will be the starvation of millions of innocent people in the German occupied countries by the British blockade. Another almost certain result is that before many months we will be nominal as well as actual participants in the struggle with all that that will entail to our democracy and our economy. There are three possible outcomes of the situation.

The first possibility is that England, with our help, will win. This is improbable. In World War I with Russia, Italy, Japan, France, Belgium, Rumania, Greece, and other countries actively allied against Germany and with Holland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark and other countries able to aid England with supplies and friendly to her cause, and with our active aid, it took four years to bring Germany to terms and this was accomplished then only through (a) hunger and (b) Wilson's promises of peace on the basis of the 14 points if the Kaiser were eliminated. Now all the above nations with the exception of Greece are either on the side of Germany or dominated by her. Germany will not be starved although France and other countries may be, and no promises of the kind of peace that will be given if Hitler is kicked out will be believed after what happened last time. To restore the status quo ante on the continent can only be achieved by a military invasion of the continent in the face of the opposition of the powerful German military machine, which is an achievement that may be ruled out as improbable of accomplishment. The only chance of defeating Germany is through starvation, which may be ruled out with what Germany now has to draw upon, or internal revolt which is unlikely except at the end of years of attrition, if at all.

The second possibility is that Germany, despite our being on the side of England, will win. This is highly improbable. In order to defeat Great Britain, Germany must in the end either starve England out or make a

successful invasion. Unless England and the United States lose command of the sea or Germany makes a successful invasion of England, neither of which seems likely, Germany cannot win.

What is left is what the present policy of the Administration, in encouraging England not to seek peace, has ordained. What is now going on will continue. Millions on the continent of Europe will suffer and die. The cities of England and Germany will be in large measure destroyed. Already the ancient landmarks are going. We may expect epidemics of disease as the war goes on year after weary year. The hatred and desire for vengeance will increase. In the end, Russia and the ideas for which Russia stands will triumph.

At long last the new order demanded by the age of power will be builded; but it will have been builded in blood and tears. Perhaps there is no other way. The individual Christian may still hope that some way short of the destruction of our civilization by the violence now let loose may be found. He must continue to resist, within himself, lies and hatred and the spirit of violence. Even in his suffering, he may rightly believe that power has now made possible the abundance on which brotherhood and a peaceful world order may be builded. Brown Landone says:

> This year we've learned some things—though whizzing raids of war may drop its tragedies about our heads, we need not let them build their bombing hates within our hearts! And though most men are much confused, we know our path is clear, for we are chosen, friend, to live these years! Of all the billions born in all the ages of the past, we are the ones chosen to live now, so that we may be present at the holy christening of the new age being born for man. The pains of war are not the pains of death; they are the labor pains of earth newborn-new human values and new joys!

We may believe that the final triumph will not rest with the United States, England, Germany, Japan, or Russia but with humanity. The times demand a unified, coöperative, and democratic world. Neither side in the present struggle represents this total ideal but slowly in the minds of men everywhere it is beginning to take shape. The truth of Jesus may yet be the experienced truth of society. Brotherhood is now possible but men must create it.

Nations Must Coöperate

O. A. HAMMAND

It is November, 1918. Firing has ceased on the western front, the smoke has blown off the fields and thirty-three million men, women, and children lie dead on the ground. There has been a war. The world has burned up four hundred billion dollars, mobilized sixty-four million men, and devoted four years to human destruction. But now the curtain has fallen over this scene of death and the nations have met to make peace.

A hot-headed Frenchman wants revenge; a hot-headed Englishman wants revenge. They do not want to fight every generation. They want to cut Germany up and wipe her off the map. The allied armies are on German soil and their leaders will not move them off until France and England are safe. Italy is in the war for conquest and Japan is in the war for conquest, and the stage is set for the dismemberment of Germany. But this plan means war every generation, with more armies and more navies and more tariffs and more propaganda and more preparation for war. There is a better way.

At this time there appeared a statesman with a broad view. It was Woodrow Wilson, the president of the United States. He understood that the basis for world peace was world justice and that world justice must come from law and order and international machinery to make needed adjustments in a changing world. In his pocket was the outline of a League of Nations. President Taft had ideas; Elihu Root had ideas; and so did Lord Cecil, General Smuts, Titulescu, and Madariago. A selected committee, representing the best brains of the world, worked over the league covenant for four and one-half months and produced the League of Nations. It furnished the equivalent of legislative, executive, and judicial powers. The Hague Tribunal had already been organized for arbitration cases; the world court and international labor organization followed. At last the world had adequate mechanism for the settlement of international problems.

But they needed one thing more—a peace sentiment—and that they did not have. There was an unintelligent, maudlin peace sentiment—a babble of words, a desire for peace, a hope for peace, but no understanding of cause and effect, no idea of what it is that makes war or makes peace. There were suggestions of shutting our gates and living like a hermit in isolation; to "keep our nose out of other people's business" and "let Europe stew in its own juice." There were suggestions of tariff walls, big armies that could whip the world, big navies, and another canal. It was proposed to "take the profit out of war," to tax industry, and to conscript men and money. They did not know that these things were the dry shavings to kindle another war. They did not know that the world had grown up and was going through serious political, social, and economic changes, and that resisting the processes of nature would bring on a revolution.

The Treaty of Versailles was signed and with it a tripartite treaty between France, England, and the United States. France refused to sign the main treaty or move her soldiers until both England and the United States signed the tripartite treaty, agreeing to come to her assistance in case she was attacked by Germany before the League got organized and was strong enough to defend her. Wilson brought the two treaties back from Paris and a little group in the senate began at once to attack the League. It had a majority of the senate but not the two-thirds provided by our antiquated system for ratifying treaties. With the failure of this treaty also went the temporary treaty of mutual assistance, and England was left to hold the sack, back France up, and police the world. This England could not do. She had not signed a two-party treaty but a three-party treaty. The United States tore up both treaties, threw them in the waste basket, and washed her hands of the whole job.

Now of course, France could not disarm and did not disarm. She violated the treaty from the beginning. So also did England violate it—she did not disarm, and neither did America disarm. All of them violated

their own treaty that they had forced on Germany and started a beautiful foundation for the demagogue and maniac, Adolf Hitler. The trouble with our senators was that they were not United States senators but township trustees. They did not have big ideas but their heads were full of little ideas. They lived at Washington and were paid by the government, but they were elected by the people back home and had no idea that America had become a world power in a world grown up. They still represented the people of their own community,—a little strip along the coast, a mountain district, a plain between two great rivers or a farming community. They had no idea that their problems were world problems.

Their opposition to the two treaties was largely opposition to Woodrow Wilson. They wanted to "put Wilson in the hole" and they succeeded in putting him in the grave. There was of course the legitimate fear that the League might obtain too much power, get out of control, and become an instrument of tyranny instead of an instrument of liberty. But the same people who howled to heaven for fear the League would be too strong, were the first to lift their voices in a mighty roar against it when it was too weak. For many years Germany and Russia were not members of the League. Afterward Germany, Italy, and Japan pulled out, and Russia was kicked out; but the United States was never in, and no nation and no man could tell what our attitude would be on any international question. Under such conditions the League functioned for years and accomplished many wonderful achievements but it could not take on the bigger jobs or prevent wars between the great powers.

When Japan overran Manchuria, the League appointed the Lytton Commission which made an investigation and condemned Japan, though recognized her interests and made substantial recommendations in her favor. America participated and provided a member of the Commission, but the United States was not a member of the League and always had her tongue in her cheek and nobody knew how much she could be depended on. In this case England is usually accused of getting cold feet and America is praised, but once again that is not correct. Secretary Stimson wanted to enforce sanctions, but President Hoover would not support him and it was our crowd who let the League down.

When Mussolini invaded Ethiopia the League attempted to apply a rule of sanctions. At this time Germany, Italy, and Japan were out of the League and unfriendly, and nobody knew what the United States would do. In the first World War we insisted on selling food and supplies to both sides and in this case America increased her sale of oil to Italy many times, doing everything to block the enforcement of sanctions. The newspapers said "Mussolini bluffs young Anthony Eden." No, Mussolini did not bluff young Anthony Eden, but with all of the powerful nations in open opposition or shifty and uncertain, Anthony Eden would not turn on the green light.

There is no chance to find a cool spot in a kettle of hot water, and there is no chance to find a cool spot in a hot world. Without law, the world is chaos and confusion and disorder and injustice, and no nation and no individual can be safe. If any nation or any individual wants safety or security or justice or peace, that nation or that individual must do something to obtain it; and that something must be to organize the world on a basis of law. And of course the better and fairer that law, the better it will be observed and the easier it is to enforce.

The world has grown up and every nation stands face to face with other nations and looks over its back yard fence into the back yards of other nations. The time is past when any nation can exercise absolute sovereignty and do just as it desires and disregard the rights of other nations. No one plan of coöperation is necessary but the nations must coöperate or else they will clash and destroy each other. When the present conflagration has burnt itself out and the world has another chance to organize, it must follow legal and moral and just processes. Every nation must observe the law and every nation must assist in enforcing it. And Uncle Sam must not duck or side-step or beat around the bush, but must put down his name and then stand by it like a man.

Challenge from a Star

Eight apostles of the Lord
Said: "We shall not draw the sword!
Brand us, jail us if you will—
We obey: 'Thou shalt not kill.'"

Eight apostles of the Lord,
Living on the earth today,
Took their stand and spoke their word—
Chose the crucifixion way.

Went the way the great ones go,
Chose the path the wise men know;
And a planet rocked with war
Hears a challenge from a star.

Eight disciples, brave with love,
Said: "A higher Law we prove."
And a country kind and free
Brands them with iniquity!

But the blaze that wraps them round,
And the fierce light streaming through
And the trembling of the ground
Usher in the Dawning new.

Men of courage, you have hurled
Such a challenge to the world,
It shall thunder through the sky
Till the sons of men reply!

Swifter than the fires of hate,
Louder than the bombs of hell
Sounds your summons at the gate:
Love has spoken—all is well!

Sounds the trumpet that will shake
All the darkened world awake.
Eight disciples! May there be
Millions more, till men are free!

ANGELA MORGAN.

In Place of Hans

WESNER FALLAW

They came that summer day in Germany, before war began, to see me, the friend and colleague of their son exiled in America. Erect and smiling, vital in a way to deny their years, they met me and made me their own from the moment their daughter and son-in-law—whose guest I was—brought us together. Not one of the four spoke any more English than I spoke German—which amounted to the little I had picked up on the boat going over and from having been in Germany ten days. But that mattered not at all, for we scarcely stopped talking from morning until late night when the old folk finally went to bed.

Of what did we speak? Of Hans, for three years a professor in America; of his wife and child whom they had never seen; of his published books; his popularity in his new country; and of all the other features of a strange place a mother with a son far away wants to visualize and get the feel of.

Blue-eyed, tall, animated—her face and manner so familiar to me in her son—the mother dominated the occasion. It was her day. And it was my day—my day to have a portion of her maternal love, for I symbolized Hans come home from exile.

It was late afternoon when a lull came in our conversation. Then: *"Bitte, Herr Professor, wollen Sie singen?"* It was the daughter, my hostess, asking me to sing for her parents. Hans must have written them of our song fests back at the college. And so I sat down at the piano and sang Burleigh's arrangement of "Deep River."

You could not tell what was going on in the minds of those gentlefolk. Maybe it was the mood of the song and maybe the voice they heard was the voice of their Hans, once more singing for his mother and father before they crossed their Jordan River and found their Promised Land.

Presently the five of us were singing German and American hymns, and there was no longer any nationalism, and borders were for map makers alone. Afterward the father and I carried the conversation. Patriarchical with his pointed beard and brilliant dark eyes, a retired preacher, he never once upbraided a government that had done him ill. Not once did he lose the bright cheer of his voice, though we pondered aloud national differences, the roots of divisiveness that sow havoc. (All this with much passing back and forth of the German-American dictionary.)

We were trying to frame an answer when, happy coincidence, both of us simultaneously referred to the trouble at Babel. "In Canada, some years ago," he smiled, mixing English and German words, "I told the people that all the trouble between nations started with the confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel."

It was that night when the mother told me what she was to say again the next morning. How she worded it and what she said in full escaped me, but it amounted to this, told ever so simply with the others listening attentively, sitting there nodding approval as they looked at me: "Because you are a friend of our Hans, we love you."

The following morning I was to motor twenty-five miles in order to take the train. I assumed that the old folk would not essay the drive, but would tell me goodbye at the house; for the day was cold and wet and they had to make a long bus trip home. The three of us, immediately after breakfast, sat together chatting while the young couple were busy about the house during the few minutes remaining before time to leave. The mother was trying to find out something from me which seemed terribly important to her. The old gentlemen attempted to help her make me understand. At that point the daughter joined us and among us we soon settled two issues: I would be glad to send them a picture of myself and I certainly would not forget to let them know when I got married.

Time to leave. But of course, all of them would be going to the station! And they did, piling into the little car, so that we were a compact group.

The hills sloped green and brown where grain was being harvested. Sleek cattle dotted the tidy landscape, sheep and cows lazily full at the height of the growing year. And soon all over the *Vaterland* the harvest would be gathered. Then . . .?

But the question remained unasked in the car racing along the winding roadway bounded on either side by linden trees. This was the last hour of togetherness. This was the breaking of ties lifelong. Nobody could have convinced us that we, the old couple and I, had but a scant twenty-four hours before met for the first time.

The big railroad station stood back of the plaza where we parked the car. It would be all of a half-mile walk to the train. We were climbing out of the car, collecting baggage. Now was the time for the mumbled *Auf Wiedersehen.* Now the time to hear the old minister invoke the blessings of *Herr Gott* upon me. For surely the mother and father would remain in the car, not wearying themselves with walking and waiting by the tracks. But no; we were five across the plaza, into and through the station. Still five as we made our way to the right track and down the long platform.

It was not just the son-in-law who saw after my baggage and found the right compartment in the waiting train. All helped. And then only seven minutes remained before the train would leave. Back on the platform we waited together. More talk of Hans and the messages I was to take to him. . . . All saying again my visit had made them happy . . . all wishing me a good journey and a safe return.

Meanwhile, first the mother and then the father would ease away, approach the train window and peer intently into my compartment—just to make sure my baggage was still quite all right.

The train would leave on the dot. That was why they saw to it that I got on just at the right moment. Through the window we clasped hands once again . . . *"Auf Wiedersehen!"* . . . *"Gute Reise!"* again and again—and all the blessings of God, as the train moved slowly away. They were still smiling and waving, the four of them standing close, when the train, gathering speed, took me from view.

On the Pacifist Front

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

[Under the heading "On the Pacifist Front" there will be published in UNITY from time to time such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. Readers are urgently invited to send to me such items of interest as may come to their attention.]

XXXII

The annual meeting of the Ohio Pastors Convention, attended by 700 delegates, adopted unanimously a resolution opposing the Lend-Lease Bill, and further, according to local newspaper report,

> . . . demanded public announcement of the issues at stake, information on war industry profits and assurance that Congress "will not surrender to war hysteria."

The *Christian Century* reports that thirty-two ministers and theological students have gone to prison in this country for refusing to register under the draft act on grounds of conscientious objection to war.

The first two conscientious objectors actually brought to trial in New York on pleas of "not guilty," Albert Herling and Francis Hall, were convicted and sentenced to federal prison for two years. Herling, before receiving sentence, said:

> My belief in human life is sacred. I have not any right to take part in any legislation the result of which will be sacrifice of human life. I do not want to see the United States a totalitarian country, but this act would make it so. This act would provide armies of millions and make this country the same as Russia, Spain, Germany, and Japan, where civil liberties are denied. I cannot coöperate with a law I feel detrimental and subversive.

William Allen Winslow, a New York conscientious objector sentenced to imprisonment for eighteen months for refusing to register, made the following statement to the court:

> I believe that there are other methods than war to defend these United States. I am not trying to be a martyr, but I am trying to follow the teachings of Jesus and to be a good Christian. I believe that more can be accomplished toward ending Fascism, in this and in other countries, by a campaign of passive resistance than by war.

The *Christian News-Letter,* of England, publishes the following:

> An account of the aims of a new society formed a few months ago by Roman Catholics and called "The Sword of the Spirit" is given in an article by Mr. Christopher Dawson in the January number of the *Dublin Review.* Attempts by the State to set itself in the place of God are, he points out, as old as history. But in the past the power of the State was limited by the means at its disposal; the new thing is that today its power is unlimited. Through the immense machinery of party, police and propaganda and the new techniques provided by psychology and technical inventions the modern totalitarian state is able to control not only men's lives, property, and work but their family, leisure, and thought. By an unceasing process of repression and stimulation, of suggestion and terrorization, a systematic assault is made on the citadel of the personality, and men's ways of thinking and feeling are conditioned without their being aware of it. In these circumstances there can be no place for religion unless it forfeits its spiritual freedom and becomes the tool of the State. This would be the sin against the Holy Ghost in the most absolute sense. The Church must, therefore, take up its prophetic office and bear witness to the Word, even if it means the judgment of the nations and open war with the powers of the world. Every world crisis is, as the word denotes, a judgment and a decision out of which something new must come. It is an opportunity to hear the Word of God and for the Spirit to manifest its creative power to humanity.
>
> The purpose of the movement of the Sword of the Spirit is to provide channels for these divine forces. What we have to work and pray for is not an alliance with the temporal power, as in the old Christendom, and an external conformity to Christian standards, but a *reordering of all the elements of human life and civilization by the power of the Spirit;* the birth of a true community which is neither an inorganic mass of individuals nor a mechanized organization of power but a living spiritual order.

Mrs. Kathleen Sayre, wife of John Nevin Sayre, writes in *Fellowship* of the practice of the weekly fast for raising money to feed the starving abroad:

> Ever since the Chautauqua Conference, last September, our family, consisting of grandmother, parents, three children, seventeen, fifteen, and thirteen, and any guest who may be present, have gathered around the dinner table each Thursday evening—the candles are lighted, and, instead of food, there is placed on the table a rather lovely alabaster bowl containing the money which would have been spent on the meal.
>
> Instead of eating, we have a simple ceremony of dedication. First, a reading, presenting some angle of the problem, perhaps an account from the records of Friends about child feeding during and after the last war or the story of the Chinese boy who gave up his bicycle and gave the money to feed Chinese children, or a newspaper or magazine article telling of the attempts being made now to get food to the people in Europe. This is followed by discussion. Then we pray for peace, for social justice, for international understanding; and, finally, the money is offered to God, to be used to help feed His children.

Fellowship, the monthly organ of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, publishes an account of the sentencing of the seven sons of Paul Marquardt, of Minnesota, for refusing to register for the draft. The father during the last war served a jail term for refusing to register.

> Paul Marquardt was a member of the Lutheran Church until the first World War, when he severed all church ties because of the pledges made by the ministers at that time in support of the war. Since then, the family has attended no church, but the father has taught them the Bible and Christian pacifism. The seven younger men were convicted in the Federal Court at Duluth, after Judge Gunnar Nordbye sought patiently to convince them that they would not be acting contrary to religion if they registered. Paul Marquardt was also convicted and sentenced to a year and a day for counselling, aiding, and abetting his sons and relatives to evade registration. However, the judge stated that someone would have to look after the farms and the women folk, and told Paul Marquardt to go home and report to him again on March 1st. The young men are in the Industrial Reformatory at Sandstone, Minnesota.
>
> Asked in the course of the trial what he would do if someone came in and stole the livestock from his farm, one of the young defendants answered: "Well, our family has always figured that if we lived right, we wouldn't have those things happen to us."

The *Christian Century* publishes the following:

> "The church must not again become the concubine of Caesar," declared Wilbur E. Hammaker, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Denver area, in a recent issue of the *Rocky Mountain Churchman.* "I feel like exclaiming to my war-minded fellow churchmen, 'Oh, foolish Americans, who hath bewitched you?'"

More than six hundred of the leading clergymen of this country have signed and published the following statement:

Twenty-two years after Armistice Day of the First World War and eleven years after the breakdown of capitalism, the world finds itself no nearer international peace than in 1914, and far from a state of economic security.

Notwithstanding the utter failure of our effort in 1917 to "make the world safe for democracy" through the method of war, by entering the European conflict on the side of the Allies, we are now told by the President and his cabinet that democracy must again be saved; that the British Empire is our first line of defense; and that all aid (no longer stated as "short of war") must be given to England, or the United States will be invaded and enslaved by the German State.

The President and his advisers seek to commit our Nation irrevocably to this policy through passage by the Congress of the so-called Lend-Lease Bill (H R 1776) which gives to one man, without restriction as to duration of time, or expenditure of billions, the power to wage war in any part of the globe—in the name of Democracy!

We, the undersigned ministers and rabbis, conscious of our responsibility as citizens of a republic and, to an extent, as leaders of public opinion, denounce this proposed legislation because of its violation of the democratic principles on which this Nation was founded, and because of the unprecedented and unconstitutional power thus placed in the hands of the President even in a time of peace.

We are not disturbed by the threat of invasion by Germany, or by any combination of nations, even should the British Empire be broken in the present war.

We look upon this war—which is but a continuation of the struggle of 1914-18 for imperialist supremacy in Europe, Asia, and Africa—not as the vital, or final, issue in our international disorder and violence, but only as a symptom of the deep-seated disease causing all modern warfare. That fatal malady is the poverty and economic insecurity of the masses of all nations, including our own, caused by the maladjustments of industry and commerce prevailing throughout the dominant industrialized countries.

We find ourselves in accord with the leaders of the Church of England, including the Archbishop of York and 200 other churchmen—among whom were 23 Bishops and 14 Deans—meeting last month in Malvern College where, in a resolution adopted without a dissenting vote, it was declared that:

"After the war our aim must be the unification of Europe as a coöperative commonwealth." [Note: Seven years ago over 18,000 ministers of the United States—88 per cent of those replying to a questionnaire—stated that a coöperative commonwealth appeared to them more consistent with the ideals and methods of Jesus and the noblest of the Hebrew prophets than other economic systems. In the same questionnaire 14,000 (67 per cent) against 4,600 (22 per cent) voted their belief "that the churches of America should now go on record as refusing to sanction or support future wars."]

"Christian doctrine must insist," says the English churchmen's resolution, "that production exists for consumption. . . . To a large extent production is carried on not to supply the consumer with goods but to bring profits to the producer. . . . The satisfaction of human needs [must be] accepted as the only true end of production."

Sir Richard Acland, speaking at this churchmen's Conference, said: "In order to save humanity from the horror of . . . Naziism, we must find a way of living superior, not merely to Naziism, but to that which we ourselves knew before. . . . We are unprepared for this. . . . You must be prepared to offend people who are determined to preserve the existing order. . . . I beg of you now to proclaim the new society openly . . . So only will you save yourselves and us."

We call upon our Nation, especially our labor forces, to not only insist upon the maintenance of the inadequate social and labor gains already achieved, but to move forward now —not waiting for the close of this war—to establish the coöperative order as a way of life for America, as an example to the world which is so sorely in need of a "new society"—and the path to this "new order" is not by the way of war.

We reaffirm our conviction that war as an instrument of national policy settles no issues in the moral realm, is futile in the political, wasteful and suicidal in the economic, and in the religious, a denial of God.

We believe that war, as a method of settling international controversies, is outmoded and barbarous; and that the evil which holds us to it, with all its new and vicious terrors, can and must be broken where we are.

We, therefore, renounce war, in accordance with the principles of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, and refuse to support this, or any future war.

The Study Table

The Voice of Zona Gale

STILL SMALL VOICE: THE BIOGRAPHY OF ZONA GALE. *By August Derleth. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.* 319 *pp.* $3.00.

When Zona Gale was eight years old, she decided to be an author. Born in 1874, she received her idea of literature, as did those of her generation, from Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress.* The unforgettable influence was her father's indomitable spirit: his insight into the folly of war. "Secretary of War . . . Why not a Secretary of Peace, if anything?" Zona Gale saw clearly; she saw where others could not see, and yet she was patient. A great virtue this! Sensitive to any injustice, she flew to the aid of Glenn Frank in his attempt to guide the University through the rocks of politics. Zona Gale saw the result of tax-supported, politician-controlled education. A humanitarian, she heard the still small voice of suffering, and, because she loved her fellowmen, she tried to make human life more livable. In 1918, she wrote John Haynes Holmes, "Something else is at work besides us and in the most practical ways." The outlook, the prophetic spirit of Zona Gale, was much like that of John Haynes Holmes whom she "profoundly admired." Winner of the Pulitzer Prize, she will live in the literature of America. But her books and plays and poetry were not the greatest achievement of Zona Gale. It was her insight into reality that made her great. I met Zona Gale once, but that one meeting was unforgettable. Suddenly I realized that her spirit was greater than her pen. Her still small voice will live, even after her books are forgotten. Zona Gale was fortunate in having August Derleth, a man who knows her beloved Wisconsin, as her biographer. He writes sympathetically and understandingly. This book comes at an opportune time; in this day of chaos, it will help many a frustrated seeker to find an ever-abiding truth.

C. A. HAWLEY.

The "Moral Equivalent of War"

WAR WITHOUT VIOLENCE. *By Krishnalal Shridharani. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.* 351 *pp.* $2.50.

One might fill a page with all the superlatives in the English language and then feel he had not done justice to the value of this volume. I wish there were some way to persuade both pacifists and non-pacifists of the need for a careful study of this doctor's dissertation, submitted to one of the faculties of Columbia University. A non-pacifist college graduate in my church read it with increasing amazement, and at the end said, "The greatest book I ever read."

It is a very objective and scientific study of the

method that Mahatma Gandhi has used both in South Africa and in India against the injustices of the British invaders. Mr. Shridharani from about the age of eighteen to twenty-three was a soldier in the Satyagrahic army of the Mahatma. This was about 1929 to 1934. Then he came to this country and took about five years preparing this volume with the help of the criticism of such men as Professors MacIver and Lynd of Columbia; Professor Pratt of Williams; Professors Abel, von Schelting, Chaddock, and Peffer of Columbia; and Professor James T. Shotwell of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Its objectivity is amazing when one realizes that the author was a participant in so much of what he writes.

This scientific objectivity, however, does not detract from the readability of the volume. Plan a party some evening, and read how Gandhi's soldiers marched with bared breasts against British bayonets over and over again until British Tommies simply refused to mow down men so brave! Here you will find the details of the infamous Amritsar massacre under the equally infamous General Dyer; thrilling episodes on the famous march of Gandhi from Ahmedabad to Dandi to violate the British salt law; reasons why Gandhi, even in his life, has not become to 300,000,000 of India's masses the founder of a new religion.

Here you see Lord Irwin (now Lord Halifax, Britain's ambassador to the United States), as Viceroy of India, completely overcome by the kindly weapons that the Mahatma uses. He made peace with Gandhi. Evidently the British government violated the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. We assume Lord Halifax was outmaneuvered by his government.

The book is divided into three parts. Part I gives the Technique of Satyagraha, just how it is done. Part II shows us Satyagraha in Practice. This portion includes some fascinating details about Gandhi's boyhood and youth, for our author draws heavily, when outside his own experience in the movement, from Gandhi's *The Story of My Experiments with Truth*. Part III elaborates The Theory of Satyagraha. This includes one of the most interesting of the eleven chapters, "The Leader with a Halo."

I am confident that between the covers of this book will be found the "moral equivalent of war."

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

Woman and Archaeology

GERTRUDE BELL. *By Ronald Bodley and Lorna Hearst. New York: The Macmillan Company.* $2.50.

Gertrude Bell has achieved imperishable fame. She stands in the line of Helena, mother of Constantine, and the long line of women who have furthered the science of archaeology. It seems not generally to be known how influential women have been in the history of exploration and in the pursuit of archaeology. Gertrude Bell (1868-1926) grew up in the heritage of the British Empire with its far-flung provinces and colonies. Early in life she was seized with a love for the Orient, a love which never leaves the one who sees its beauty. She loved the desert and braved its sands even to the dismay of the native Arabs. She worked with the greatest archaeologists of her time as an equal. C. L. Woolley, T. E. Lawrence, Sir William Ramsay, H. St. John Philby, David Hogarth, and others recognized her true greatness as a scholar and colleague. Gertrude Bell was also an empire-builder. It was she who helped King Faisal to set in order the government of Iraq. No history of the British Empire can be complete without the name and work of Gertrude Bell. Finally in 1926, worn out by arduous labors among the Arabs whom she loved and who loved her, she died in Baghdad. She was buried beside the Tigris. Her monument is the new Mesopotamia. The principal wing of the Baghdad museum bears her name at the request of King Faisal. This biography is only the beginning of the biography that some day will be written. The next biography should give greater place to Gertrude Bell as an author and should include many of her important letters. Truly a great woman was Gertrude Bell. Her name will live forever beside the Tigris.

C. A. HAWLEY.

The Field

(Continued from page 2)

cost of the lands, labor, and buildings. A coöperative is to be organized under the Brazilian Department of Agriculture. It is expected that this coöperative "prototype" plant will acquaint numbers of Brazilians with the process. United States manufacturers will benefit in this two-way process since American machinery and equipment will be needed to set up these initial programs and others developed by the Commission. Financing will be handled privately or, perhaps, by the Export-Import Bank or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In the resolution authorizing the establishment of the Inter-American Development Commission, it is designated as a permanent commission which shall secure the technical and basic information necessary to carry out the projects agreed upon, establish contacts between interested parties, and recommend what facilities and assurances should come from Latin-American governments. Its projects are to be devoted to (1) the exploration and exploitation of the mineral resources in Latin America; (2) the cultivation and marketing of agricultural and forest products; and (3) the establishment and development of industrial plants. Interpreted in concrete terms, the Commission plans to carry out its mandate by stimulating importation of non-competitive goods from South America into the United States, stimulating and increasing trade between the Latin-American countries themselves, and encouraging development of industry in Latin America, particularly in production of consumer-goods.—*Nofrontier News Service.*

The Midlands

The Midlands are the heart of Britain's war industry—*News item.*

The Midlands are not only guns and tanks,
Planes and munitions and the tools of death—
But they are Oxford and the Avon's banks,
And Huntington, where Cromwell first drew breath.

They are that forest where brave Robin Hood
Roamed with his men through legendary shade;
They are that Bosworth Field where Richard stood
By fallen petals which the Roses made.

And what of Coventry, whose silent street
Knew a fair lady and her famous ride?
And Leicestershire with all its meadows sweet,
Through which the small streams glide?

O ghost of Walton, holding quiet rod
In some green heaven far from time and place,
These were your valleys, these were Shakespeare's sod—
God save them for our race!

ADIN BALLOU,
in the New York *Herald-Tribune.*

Correspondence

Democracy and the Negro

Editor of UNITY:

The article by Myles D. Blanchard, "Hitlerism in America," in UNITY of January 20, challenges attention and arouses sympathy, but it needs certain qualifications. Without them, it may suggest unsound and mischievous conclusions.

Of course, democracy in this country is sadly incomplete and imperfect. As President Roosevelt says, we still have a long way to go. The goal, however, will not be reached by exaggeration, recrimination, and sweeping indictments. It will have to be approached gradually. Human nature being what it is, gradualism in *all* reform is inevitable. The English Fabians are right in this cardinal doctrine of theirs. Short cuts and violent leaps beget reaction. Lincoln was right on slavery, and the extremists who condemned his course were unwise doctrinaires. Reconstruction in the South did the Negro harm, not good.

The treatment of the Negro in the South is shocking. We see this even in Winter Park, a community full of northern liberals and humanitarians. Rollins College, the University Club, certain groups of men and women are working—patiently and slowly, to be sure, but earnestly, since they have to reckon with majority sentiment and seek cooperation, not hostility—but working sincerely for improvement in several directions.

There is no "Hitlerism" in America. Hitler is counter-revolutionary; he represents black reaction and savagery: he has repudiated all the values of western civilization. He is what some scientists have recently called an "apeman," a man without conscience or moral decency. In America, our problem arises from mass conservatism, and the solution surely is education, more education, and still more education. We have no concentration camps, no intellectual slavery, no suppression of science and liberal arts. We discuss our evils and shortcomings and we entertain well-grounded hope of further progress, economic and social. To call our conservatives "Hitlerites" is therefore unfair and injudicious.

Let us combat Hitlerism wherever it rears its ugly and monstrous head, but let us recognize degrees of injustice. We have anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism as well as anti-negro forces, and they are all undemocratic and un-American in spirit and in principle. But let us remember that the Negroes *have achieved much* since the Emancipation proclamation, and that the other racial and religious minorities have much more freedom, opportunity and security here than anywhere under Nazi or Fascist rule. The victims of discrimination and wrong command much popular sympathy and can count on the government of the nation, in all its departments, for support and defense.

Booker T. Washington was a wise leader. *He* would have endorsed the foregoing observations.

VICTOR S. YARROS.

Winter Park, Florida.

The Bible Trap—and Lincoln!

Editor of UNITY:

You know how much it has always gone against the grain for me to take issue with you on any deeply ethical question. And really it is not with your ethics now with which I differ. In part, it is with your falling into that worst of all theological traps: trying to prove anything biblical by quoting chapter and verse, as you seem to do in your leading editorial, "We Wonder," in UNITY of February 3. After referring to various verses in *Matthew*, you say "Christianity has a definite ethical code which does not recognize violence, hatred, vengeance, and bloodshed." This statement leans heavily on *Matthew*: 25; but what do you make of the words in verses 41-46? "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment." Are these curses a part of "Christianity's ethical code"?

Again, in a non-biblical field, you put at the head of your pacifist editorial words of Abraham Lincoln. Would it be asking too much of your sportsmanship to head some subsequent editorial with the words of the great Lincoln in the following passage from the second inaugural?

"Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue till all the wealth piled by the bondman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said, 'The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether'."

JAMES A. FAIRLEY.

Westport, Connecticut.

Objections to Mr. Chworowsky's Article

I

Editor of UNITY:

I am compelled to write you about the article in UNITY for February 3rd on "What Did Jesus Say about War?" Somehow it did not seem to synchronize with the spirit of UNITY, if you know what I mean. It seemed to me ultra-sophisticated and ultra-analytical to the point of attenuation. Quite lacking in vision—that vision which breeds creative power!

FLORA WHITE.

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

II

Editor of UNITY:

Reading Mr. Chworowsky's "What Did Jesus Say about War?" one is led to ask if it is not more reasonable to discuss these recorded words in connection not alone with his actions but with those of his followers. I am sure Mr. Chworowsky will agree with me that considering all the circumstances surrounding the recording of such words, and the various translations of the scriptures, it is fruitless to consider the matter of Jesus' attitude toward war from but one of those angles. Let us take the incident of the refusal of early Christians to bear arms in the service of the Roman empire, surely an amazing departure from custom in those times! That they did so refuse is certain, according to Mr. Chworowsky, although he misses the point that these people were martyrs *because* they were Christians, and for no other reason. Moreover they were close to their Master in the point of time and they did take him "seriously." And did not Jesus take himself seriously when he said to Peter: "Put up thy sword," words by the way which your commentator does not cite?

Another thing which seems to have escaped him is that the true Jesus-Christianity obtained but for a short time save only as it furnished the base for the superstructure of the Pauline Christianity which is all the present world has ever known. That this much less idealistic phase was a necessity in the case of a religion adopted for the express purpose of holding together a while longer Constantine's breaking empire, no one will deny; nor should one deny that we are confronted today with another fast-breaking empire, one in which recognition of approaching fatality is so strong among its own leaders and spokesmen that they are asking—nay, demanding—help from the United States without stint or limit, entirely ignoring the strong conviction of the keenest observers of the international *mise-en-scene* that empire-control everywhere is nearing its end.

There are other passages in Mr. Chworowsky's thesis which show how difficult it is to build a sound argument on a faulty foundation, but space will hardly permit their consideration. However, from the point of view of theological discussion, a word should be said apropos of the light that the article in question sheds on the inherent weaknesses of what we know as Christianity, a body of religious thought more properly to be designated as a Hebraic-Christian cult, and so very naturally, permeated with denials and contradictions. "An eye for an eye" versus the Golden Rule makes for devastating confusion. But even so, Daniel visualized the time when he should stand in his lot; and certain Christians even today look forward to that "blessed" time. Naturally, to them, the total sweeping away of empires today is but the necessary and destined prelude, expressing the wrath (zeal) of God, but executed by His instruments,—mankind.

The writer of this is one of those who firmly believes that "the sayings of the Master must be interpreted in the 'spirit' of his whole life." Here I cite the words of Mr. Chworowsky who asks: "Who shall be the ultimate authority in interpreting the message?" To which I reply—also in his words: Let it be one's "conscience," and let it be "in the name of high religion." And this, even if it necessitates standing with the *tiny minority*, which holds to the conviction that nothing can excuse the sin of war which, as Tolstoi showed us long ago, embraces all the other sins of humankind.

BLANCHE WATSON.

New York City.